

# PNJL model with a Vandermonde term

Sanjay K. Ghosh\* and Tamal K. Mukherjee†

*Department of Physics, Bose Institute, 93/1, A.P.C. Road, Kolkata 700 009, India.*

Munshi G. Mustafa‡ and Rajarshi Ray§

*Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF, Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700 064, India.*

We extend the Polyakov-Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (PNJL) model for two degenerate flavours by including the effect of the SU(3) measure with a Vandermonde (VdM) term. This ensures that the Polyakov loop always remains in the domain  $[0,1]$ . The pressure, energy density, specific heat, speed of sound and conformal measure show small or negligible effects from this term. However various quark number and isospin susceptibilities are all found to approach their respective ideal gas limits around  $2 T_c$ . We compare our methods with other similar approaches in PNJL model and also present a quantitative comparison with Lattice QCD data.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Aw, 12.38.Mh, 12.39.-x

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, there is a lot of interest in the studies of thermodynamics of strongly interacting matter using the Polyakov loop enhanced Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (PNJL) model [1–3]. This model couples the chiral and deconfinement order parameters through a simple-minded coupling of the NJL model [4] with the Polyakov loop model [5]. The two major thrusts in recent times have been to estimate various thermodynamic observables using this model (see e.g. [6–10]), and to make systematic improvements of the model [11–13]. Another set of important result has come from similar studies in chiral quark models that go beyond the mean field treatment [14].

In this note we deal with the improvement of the Polyakov loop model and describe some of its consequences, remaining within the domain of mean field analysis. The Polyakov loop model used in many of the recent literature is the one given in Ref.[3]. The Polyakov loop  $\Phi$  has been treated here as a Z(3) spin field [15]. Using this model we estimated [6] a very sensitive observable - the quark number susceptibility (QNS) and also the higher order coefficients in the Taylor expansion of pressure in quark number chemical potential  $\mu_0$ . Comparison with the data from Lattice QCD (LQCD) [16] showed that the QNS in the PNJL model and LQCD agree quite well both qualitatively and quantitatively. The fourth order coefficient  $c_4$  showed qualitative agreement but had a quantitative difference at high temperatures. Some of us further extended the PNJL model to include isospin chemical potential  $\mu_I$  [8]. The isospin number susceptibility (INS) and its derivative with respect to  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_I$  were obtained. In this case the fourth order derivative  $c_4^I$  was quite consistent with lattice data, but the INS was not. A possible reason for such departures is that the mean-field treatment of the PNJL model is insufficient. But then it should have affected the coefficients systematically *i.e.*, all the fourth order coefficients should deviate further from LQCD data than the second order coefficients.

There are however other *simpler* reasons that should be considered first. The PNJL model is only a model which can mimic some of the characteristics of a fundamental theory like QCD and its discretized version LQCD. Moreover, the parameters like the couplings and masses are quite different in the PNJL model and the LQCD simulations. Thus some quantitative difference is naturally expected. Apart from these we made an important observation in [8] that  $\Phi$  has a big role to play in the behaviour of these coefficients. We pointed out how the quantitative differences could be caused by the behaviour of  $\Phi$  as a function of temperature and chemical potentials. The most important *physical problem* in the simple-minded PNJL model is the following.  $\Phi$  being the normalized trace of the Wilson line  $\mathbf{L}$ , which is an SU(3) matrix, should lie in the range  $0 \leq \Phi \leq 1$ . But it was found to be greater than 1 at temperatures above  $2T_c$  (see Fig.2 in Ref. [8]). The natural way to cure this problem is to consider a proper Jacobian of transformation from the matrix valued field  $L$  to the complex valued field  $\Phi$  which will then constrain the value of  $\Phi$  to  $\Phi < 1$ . This is quite a well known construction in SU(N) matrix model (see e.g.[17–19]), in certain variations of Polyakov loop

---

\*Electronic address: [sanjay@bosemain.boseinst.ac.in](mailto:sanjay@bosemain.boseinst.ac.in)

†Electronic address: [tamal@bosemain.boseinst.ac.in](mailto:tamal@bosemain.boseinst.ac.in)

‡Electronic address: [munshigolam.mustafa@saha.ac.in](mailto:munshigolam.mustafa@saha.ac.in)

§Electronic address: [rajarshi.ray@saha.ac.in](mailto:rajarshi.ray@saha.ac.in)

model ([11, 20]), as well as in QCD motivated phenomenological models (see [21] and references therein). Also this is ubiquitous in various strong coupling effective theories of Lattice QCD (see e.g. [23]).

Here we introduce the Vandermonde term in the Polyakov loop model in a conceptually different way than that in the earlier models. In the next section we discuss our approach. In section III we show the changes in measurements of the susceptibilities and various other quantities due to the VdM term. The final section contains our conclusions.

## II. FORMALISM

At a temperature  $T$ , the SU(3) Wilson line is given by  $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}\exp(ig \int_0^{1/T} A_0^a(\mathbf{x}) \lambda_a d\tau)$ , where  $g$  is the gauge coupling,  $A_0^a$  ( $a = 1, 2, \dots, 8$ ) are the time-like components of the gluon field,  $\lambda_a$  are the Gell-Mann matrices and  $\tau$  the imaginary time in the Euclidian field theory. The Polyakov loop is defined as  $\Phi = \text{tr} \mathbf{L} / 3$  and its conjugate is  $\bar{\Phi} = \text{tr} \mathbf{L}^\dagger / 3$ . Since  $\mathbf{L}$  is itself a SU(3) matrix so  $\Phi, \bar{\Phi} \leq 1$ . The gluon thermodynamics can be described as an effective theory of the Polyakov loops [5]. On the other hand quark thermodynamics can be effectively described in terms of NJL model [4], and the two are coupled to obtain the PNJL model (e.g., [3]). The thermodynamic potential in this model can be obtained in terms of the sigma and pion condensates and the thermal average of the Polyakov loop.

However the version of the PNJL model [3] leads to  $\Phi > 1$  for  $T > 2T_c$ . To rectify this anomaly, the authors of Ref. [3] have recently proposed a complete modification of the Polyakov loop model [11], motivated from the strong coupling results used by Fukushima [2]. Our aim in this work is also similar, but the approach is somewhat different. We retain the Polyakov loop potential of [3, 6, 8] but treat it as a matrix model. Also the way we define pressure is quite different as discussed below.

We first outline our scheme using an arbitrary matrix model for the Wilson line  $\mathbf{L}$ , which for simplicity is assumed to be a potential  $\mathcal{V}[\mathbf{L}] \equiv \mathcal{V}[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}]$ . In the following equation, we express the partition function for this theory first as a path integral over  $\mathbf{L}$  and then over the fields  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$ .

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{L} e^{-\frac{1}{T} \mathcal{V}[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}]} = \int \prod_{\mathbf{x}} d\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{x}) e^{-\frac{1}{T} \mathcal{V}[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}]} \quad (1a)$$

$$= \int \prod_{\mathbf{x}} J[\Phi(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})] d\Phi(\mathbf{x}) d\bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) e^{-\frac{1}{T} \mathcal{V}[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}]} \quad (1b)$$

where,  $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{L}$  is the SU(3) Haar measure,  $J[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}]$  is the Jacobian of transformation (also called Vandermonde determinant, see e.g. Ref. [24]) from  $\mathbf{L}$  to  $(\Phi, \bar{\Phi})$ , and is given as  $J[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}] \equiv (27/24\pi^2)(1 - 6\bar{\Phi}\Phi + 4(\bar{\Phi}^3 + \Phi^3) - 3(\bar{\Phi}\Phi)^2)$ . Our interest then would be to obtain the pressure which is given by,

$$P = T \frac{\partial \ln Z}{\partial v} = - \left\langle \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}}{\partial v} \right\rangle \simeq - \frac{1}{v} \langle \mathcal{V} \rangle \quad (2)$$

where,  $v$  denotes the physical volume of the system and  $\langle \rangle$  denotes thermal averaging. The last approximation holds in the infinite volume limit.

The role of the Jacobian is to be understood as follows. First, it is a factor reweighting the field configurations and hence significantly affects all thermal averages. However the Jacobian is not explicitly space-time dependent, there is no extra term to be averaged in Eqn. 2 as one might expect when redefining the path integration from  $\mathbf{L}$  to  $\Phi$  (Eqn. 1a to Eqn. 1b). A typical example of such a dependence would be if we were considering say a Fourier transform of the fields. In case of a free field this kind of dependence of the Jacobian on the volume and temperature is very important in obtaining the correct partition function.

Thus, in our mean field treatment we have to carefully incorporate the effect of the Jacobian and this is the main aim of this paper. The effect of the Jacobian is reflected in the mean fields  $\langle \Phi \rangle$  and  $\langle \bar{\Phi} \rangle$ , and we express the pressure as,

$$P = - \frac{1}{v} \mathcal{V}(\langle \Phi \rangle, \langle \bar{\Phi} \rangle). \quad (3)$$

To relate to pure glue theory, we now replace the potential density  $\mathcal{V}/v$  by a Landau-Ginzburg type functional  $\mathcal{U}$ , given by[3],

$$\frac{\mathcal{U}(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}, T)}{T^4} = - \frac{b_2(T)}{2} \bar{\Phi}\Phi - \frac{b_3}{6} (\Phi^3 + \bar{\Phi}^3) + \frac{b_4}{4} (\bar{\Phi}\Phi)^2, \quad (4)$$

with

$$b_2(T) = a_0 + a_1 \left(\frac{T_0}{T}\right) + a_2 \left(\frac{T_0}{T}\right)^2 + a_3 \left(\frac{T_0}{T}\right)^3. \quad (5)$$




FIG. 1:  $\Phi$  and  $P/P_{SB}$  for  $\kappa = 0$  ( $T_0 = 0.27$  GeV) and  $\kappa = 0.5$  ( $T_0 = 0.2555$  GeV). The value of  $T_c$  is 0.270 GeV.

To make a saddle point approximation to the mean fields, the potential density  $\mathcal{U}$  was minimized w.r.t.  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  in Ref. [3]. These were then used to obtain pressure  $P = -\mathcal{U}$ . The coefficients  $a_i$  ( $i=0,1,2,3$ ) and  $b_j$  ( $j=2,3,4$ ) were fitted from Lattice data of pressure in pure gauge theory, and  $T_0$  is precisely the transition temperature  $T_c = 270$  MeV [25–27]. As  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $P/T^4 \rightarrow 16\pi^2/90$ . However, to take care of the effect of the Jacobian as discussed above, we now propose to minimize the following modified potential,

$$\frac{\mathcal{U}'(\Phi, \bar{\Phi})}{T^4} = \frac{\mathcal{U}(\Phi, \bar{\Phi})}{T^4} - \kappa \ln[J(\Phi, \bar{\Phi})], \quad (6)$$

where  $\kappa$  is a dimensionless parameter to be determined phenomenologically. The mean field value of pressure is still obtained from the relation  $P = -\mathcal{U}$ . A very simple example of this approach is demonstrated in the appendix. Note that the Jacobian term is considered as an extra effective term in the modified potential density implying a sort of normalized volume factor. This is quite natural as the form of Eqn. 1b implies that there is a Jacobian sitting at each and every space-time coordinate, depending on the value of  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$ .




FIG. 2:  $\Phi$  and  $P/P_{SB}$  for  $\kappa = 0$  ( $T_0 = 0.27$  GeV) and  $\kappa = (0.22 T_0^3/T^3)$  ( $T_0 = 0.2555$  GeV). Here  $T_c = 0.270$  GeV.

With the new minimization condition all the coefficients should be estimated afresh. Instead, we retain the values of  $a_i$  and  $b_j$  obtained in [3] and tune only the values of  $T_0$  and  $\kappa$ . This is equivalent to a correlated modification of the  $a_i$  and  $b_j$  keeping  $T_0$  fixed at 270 MeV.

We show the variation of the Polyakov loop and the pressure  $P$  normalized to Stefan-Boltzmann (SB) pressure  $P_{SB}$  for pure gauge theory, as a function of temperature. In Fig.1 we have used a small non-zero constant value of  $\kappa = 0.05$ . In Fig.2 we find similar behaviour for a temperature dependent  $\kappa = 0.22T_0^3/T^3$ . In both the figures the  $\kappa = 0$  curves are for the Polyakov loop model without the VdM term. Thus the parameter space of  $\kappa$  is quite open at this stage.

Within the range of temperatures ( $T < 3T_c$ ) where the Polyakov loop model is supposed to be a good description of the system, our approach and that of Ref. [11] give similar results. The reason behind this is that one can suitably adjust the parameters in both approaches. However, our method for introducing the VdM potential as discussed above, is very much different from that of Ref. [11]. The main difference is that the pressure computed in Ref. [11] includes the VdM term. Thus the coefficient of the VdM term requires an inverse temperature dependence, so that on a naive extrapolation to high temperatures, the pressure does not blow up with the logarithm of the Jacobian. In that case another problem crops up with the remaining part of the thermodynamic potential, which at high temperatures has no bound, contrary to the claim that  $\Phi \rightarrow 1$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Precisely because  $\Phi$  should go to 1 as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  we believe that the VdM term should be very important at high temperatures to constrain the maximum value of  $\Phi$  to 1.

The exercise for introducing a VdM term for the Polyakov loop model itself has nothing new to offer. Even without it the potential  $\mathcal{U}$  was able to describe the pure glue theory quite well. However its importance becomes evident in the PNJL model. The Polyakov loop has a coupling to the fermionic part as will be seen in the corresponding thermodynamic potential below, which forces the  $\Phi$  to be greater than 1, and more so as the chemical potential is increased. The VdM term can inhibit such a behaviour.

The thermodynamic potential of the PNJL model [3, 6, 8] is given as,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega = & \mathcal{U}(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}, T) + 2G_1(\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_d^2) + 4G_2\sigma_u\sigma_d \\ & - \sum_{f=u,d} 2T \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \ln \left[ 1 + 3 \left( \Phi + \bar{\Phi} e^{-(E_f - \mu_f)/T} \right) e^{-(E_f - \mu_f)/T} + e^{-3(E_f - \mu_f)/T} \right] \right. \\ & \left. + \ln \left[ 1 + 3 \left( \bar{\Phi} + \Phi e^{-(E_f + \mu_f)/T} \right) e^{-(E_f + \mu_f)/T} + e^{-3(E_f + \mu_f)/T} \right] \right\} - \sum_{f=u,d} 6 \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} E_f \theta(\Lambda^2 - \vec{p}^2) \quad . \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Here quark condensates for the two light flavors  $u$  and  $d$  are given by  $\sigma_u = \langle \bar{u}u \rangle$  and  $\sigma_d = \langle \bar{d}d \rangle$  respectively, and the respective chemical potentials are  $\mu_u$  and  $\mu_d$ . Note that  $\mu_0 = (\mu_u + \mu_d)/2$  and  $\mu_I = (\mu_u - \mu_d)/2$ . The quasi-particle energies are  $E_{u,d} = \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + m_{u,d}^2}$ , where  $m_{u,d} = m_0 - 4G_1\sigma_{u,d} - 4G_2\sigma_{d,u}$  are the constituent quark masses and  $m_0$  is the current quark mass (we assume flavour degeneracy).  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are the effective coupling strengths of a local, chiral symmetric four-point interaction. We take  $G_1 = G_2 = G/4$ , where  $G$  is the coupling used in Ref. [3].  $\Lambda$  is the 3-momentum cutoff in the NJL model.  $\mathcal{U}(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}, T)$  is the effective potential for  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  as given in Eqn. 4. We locate the transition temperature in this model from the peaks in the temperature variation of  $d\Phi/dT$  and  $d\sigma_{u,d}/dT$ .

Similar to the case of the Polyakov loop model we would now obtain the mean fields by minimizing,

$$\frac{\Omega'}{T^4} = \frac{\Omega}{T^4} - \kappa \ln[J(\Phi, \bar{\Phi})] \quad (8)$$

The coefficient  $\kappa$  in the VdM term can in general have some temperature and/or chemical potential dependence. Here we take a constant value  $\kappa = 0.2$  which suffices for the purpose of the present work. To set this value we looked at the two important quantities affected by the VdM term. First one is  $\Phi$  which decreases with the increase of  $\kappa$  and hence decreases the pressure. Second one is the transition temperature which increases with  $\kappa$ . Thus we try to optimize  $\kappa$  to get both the pressure and the transition temperature as close as possible to the LQCD results for two quark flavours.

On a naive extrapolation of this model to large chemical potentials, the  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  should grow towards 1 (deconfinement at large chemical potential) even at very low temperatures. Thus again the logarithmic term blows up. So if pressure is computed including the VdM term as is done in Ref. [11], an anomalous logarithmic divergence would come up. There may be some new physics that can obscure such terms by making  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$  as  $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ . But that would again run into a problem in restricting  $\Phi$  in the domain  $0 \leq \Phi \leq 1$ .

Apart from the difference in the treatment of the VdM term we would now remove the condition  $\Phi = \bar{\Phi}$  used in [11], since it has important implications for susceptibilities.

Before going over to our results let us take a digression to the Lattice computation of  $\Phi$ . On the lattice  $\Phi$  is computed from the relation [15],

$$\Phi(T) = \exp(-\Delta F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T)/2T), \quad (9)$$

where,  $\Delta F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T) = F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T) - F_{00}(T)$ , and  $F_{q\bar{q}}(r, T)$  is the free energy of a pair of heavy quark and anti-quark at a separation  $r$  at a temperature  $T$ . This has been used to define a renormalized Polyakov loop in lattice simulations of both pure gluon [28, 29] and full QCD [30]. In fact the data of [28] was used to obtain the different parameters of the Polyakov loop model in [3], and is being used by us here, and in that sense  $\Phi$  is the renormalized Polyakov loop. But even in this exercise the  $\Phi$  in the Polyakov loop model of [3] goes to 1 at large  $T$  and is thus different from lattice results for  $T > T_c$ . On the lattice the value of  $\Phi$  goes above 1 for  $T > T_c$ . It has been argued that since the  $\Phi$  measured in lattice simulations is a renormalized quantity, it is no more a character of the group  $SU(3)$  and is thus not limited to values below 1. From Eqn.9, it is evident that  $\Phi > 1$  only when  $\Delta F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T) < 0$ , and this can be very easily seen to be true in the lattice simulations and happens for  $T > T_c$ . Now, the free energy  $F_{q\bar{q}}(r, T)$  can be considered to be composed of three components, namely, a confining potential, a screening potential and an entropy part. For low temperatures the confining part is dominant and  $\Delta F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T) > 0$ . In the deconfined phase for large distances, the screening potential drops out so the entropy part is dominant which could lead to  $\Delta F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T) \simeq -T \Delta S_{q\bar{q}}(T) < 0$ , where  $\Delta S_{q\bar{q}}(T) = S_{q\bar{q}}(T) - S_{00}$ , and  $S_{q\bar{q}}(T)$  denotes the entropy of the system with a pair of quark and anti-quark. However the heavy quarks as such are not expected to contribute significantly to the entropy and it seems natural to have  $\Delta S_{q\bar{q}}(T) = 0$ , and thus  $\Delta F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T) = 0$  for  $T > T_c$ . Instead the value is negative on the lattice and  $\Delta F_{q\bar{q}}(\infty, T) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , leading to  $\Phi \rightarrow \infty$ . One has to then worry about what can bend it down towards 1 at asymptotic temperatures as was observed by Gava and Jengo in perturbative evaluation of  $\Phi$  [31]. However this perturbative calculation also points to the fact that as the temperature is lowered from asymptotic values the  $\Phi$  is greater than 1. Also recent continuum estimates in chiral quark models [32] using dimensional reduction find close agreement with both lattice and perturbative calculations.

On the other hand another lattice computation of the Polyakov loop in pure glue theory uses a renormalization dependent on temperature instead on the lattice spacing and finds the values to remain below 1 at least upto  $T \sim 3.5T_c$  [33]. We thus admit that the state of affairs with the lattice computation of  $\Phi$  is not very clear to us at this stage. There is a missing link from quantum computations to our matrix model mean-field computations.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

#### A. PNJL Model: Pressure, specific heat and speed of sound

Now we discuss the results for the PNJL model with VdM term. Here the  $\Omega'$  as given in Eqn. 8 is minimized with respect to the fields and all the thermodynamic quantities are obtained using these values. The peaks of the  $d\Phi/dT$  and  $d\sigma_{u,d}/dT$  curves, as shown in Fig. 3(a), differs by 5 MeV. Their average position, which is at 230 MeV, is taken as the transition (or crossover) temperature  $T_c$ . In spite of the significant difference of  $T_c$  in the PNJL model with the corresponding LQCD value of 192(7)(4) MeV [34], the thermodynamic quantities when plotted against the scaled temperature  $T/T_c$  show similar behaviour. We shall henceforth show the temperature dependences in terms of  $T/T_c$ .

As mentioned earlier we are using an optimized value of  $\kappa = 0.2$ . The temperature dependence of the fields are shown in Fig. 3(b). It agrees reasonably with that of the LQCD results as shown in Fig. 1 of Ref. [35]. The scaled pressure  $P/P_{SB}$  is plotted in Fig. 3(c). It slightly overestimates the LQCD pressure [36]. However it agrees well with the recent LQCD results for 2+1 flavors with almost physical quark masses [37].

Now, the energy density  $\epsilon$  is obtained from the relation,

$$\epsilon = -T^2 \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \left( \frac{\Omega}{T} \right) \right|_V = -T \left. \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial T} \right|_V + \Omega \quad . \quad (10)$$

The rate of change of energy density  $\epsilon$  with temperature at constant volume is the specific heat  $C_V$  which is given as,

$$C_V = \left. \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial T} \right|_V = -T \left. \frac{\partial^2 \Omega}{\partial T^2} \right|_V \quad . \quad (11)$$

The square of velocity of sound at constant entropy  $S$  is given by,

$$v_s^2 = \left. \frac{\partial P}{\partial \epsilon} \right|_S = \left. \frac{\partial P}{\partial T} \right|_V \bigg/ \left. \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial T} \right|_V = \left. \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial T} \right|_V \bigg/ T \left. \frac{\partial^2 \Omega}{\partial T^2} \right|_V \quad . \quad (12)$$

The conformal measure is given by,




FIG. 3: (a): Peaks in  $d\Phi/dT$  and  $d\sigma/dT$  sets the  $T_c$  at around 230 MeV. (b):  $\Phi$  and  $\sigma$  as functions of  $T/T_c$ .  
*Note:* In this figure  $\sigma = G(\sigma_u + \sigma_d)$ .

$$\mathcal{C} = \Delta/\epsilon \quad ; \quad \Delta = \epsilon - 3P \quad (13)$$




FIG. 4: (a): Temperature dependence of energy density  $\epsilon$  and specific heat  $C_V$ . (b): Temperature dependence of squared speed of sound  $v_s^2$  and conformal measure  $\Delta/\epsilon$ . The arrows on the right show the corresponding SB limit.

These quantities are plotted in Fig. 4. At higher temperatures the  $C_V$  is slightly lower than the values obtained in

[6]. However, the velocity of sound and the conformal measure remain unaltered in the whole range of temperatures. Thus the VdM term affects  $C_V$  but not quantities involving ratios of pressure and energy density e.g.  $v_s^2$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ . It is interesting to note that our earlier [6] as well as the present work, have been able to predict the value of  $v_s^2$  quite well when compared to the recent LQCD results [37]. We hope similar encouraging results would be obtained on the lattice for the specific heat.

### B. Taylor expansion of Pressure




FIG. 5: The Taylor expansion coefficients of pressure in quark number and isospin chemical potentials as functions of  $T/T_c$ . Symbols are LQCD data [16]. Arrows on the right indicate the corresponding ideal gas values.

The Taylor expansion coefficients of pressure with respect to chemical potentials have been the focus of comparison of PNJL and LQCD results [6, 8, 11, 22]. Here we have expanded the scaled pressure ( $P/T^4$ ) in a Taylor series for the quark number and isospin number chemical potentials,  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_I$  respectively,

$$\frac{P(T, \mu_0, \mu_I)}{T^4} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{n!}{j!(n-j)!} c_n^{jk}(T) \left(\frac{\mu_0}{T}\right)^j \left(\frac{\mu_I}{T}\right)^k \quad ; \quad k = n - j, \quad (14)$$

where,

$$c_n^{jk}(T) = \frac{1}{n!} \frac{\partial^n (P(T, \mu_0, \mu_I)/T^4)}{\partial (\frac{\mu_0}{T})^j \partial (\frac{\mu_I}{T})^k} \Big|_{\mu_0=0, \mu_I=0} \quad (15)$$

The  $n = \text{odd}$  terms vanish due to CP symmetry. Even for the  $n = \text{even}$  terms, due to flavour degeneracy all the coefficients  $c_n^{jk}$  with  $j$  and  $k$  both odd vanish identically. We evaluate all the 10 nonzero coefficients (including the



pressure at  $\mu_0 = \mu_I = 0$ ) upto order  $n = 6$  and compare them to LQCD data. These coefficients were evaluated in [6, 8] and certain differences were found w.r.t. LQCD data. We shall now discuss the effects of the VdM term on these coefficients.

The coefficients we deal with are given by,

$$c_n(T) = \frac{1}{n!} \left. \frac{\partial^n (P(T, \mu_0)/T^4)}{\partial (\frac{\mu_0}{T})^n} \right|_{\mu_0=0} = c_n^{n0} , \quad (16)$$

$$c_n^I(T) = \frac{1}{n!} \left. \frac{\partial^n (P(T, \mu_0, \mu_I)/T^4)}{\partial (\frac{\mu_0}{T})^{n-2} \partial (\frac{\mu_I}{T})^2} \right|_{\mu_0=0, \mu_I=0} = c_n^{(n-2)2} ; n > 1. \quad (17)$$

We present the QNS, INS and their higher order derivatives with respect to  $\mu_0$  in Fig. 5. We have plotted the LQCD data from Ref. [16] for quantitative comparison. At the second order (Fig. 5(a)) we find that the QNS  $c_2$  compares well with the LQCD data upto about  $1.2 T_c$ . Thereafter the PNJL values rise up towards the SB limit, while the LQCD values saturate at about 80% of this limit. The INS  $c_2^I$  also shows similar behaviour, but at lower temperatures it goes slightly above the corresponding LQCD values. There is no significant difference of  $c_2^I$  with and without the VdM term. However  $c_2$  was close to the LQCD result without VdM term [8], but now at high temperatures it goes above the LQCD values and approaches  $c_2^I$ . Thus at high temperatures these coefficients overestimate the LQCD results but both are almost equal to each other, similar to that observed on the Lattice. This was not so without the VdM term [8].

Now we discuss the 4<sup>th</sup> order coefficients (Fig.5(b)). The values of  $c_4$  in the PNJL model with VdM term matches closely with those of LQCD data for the full range of temperatures. This is in contrast to that found without the VdM term [6] where they were close only upto  $T \sim 1.1T_c$ . The VdM term does not affect the coefficient  $c_4^I$  which agrees well with LQCD data for the full range of  $T$ . Also both these coefficients approach each other as well as the corresponding SB limit. At the 6<sup>th</sup> order (Fig.5(c)) the coefficients do not seem to be affected by the VdM term.

Thus we write down the salient features regarding the Taylor coefficients in this modified PNJL model:

- All the coefficients start approaching their respective SB limit around  $2T_c$ .
- Both the QNS and INS approach each other at  $2T_c$ . This is also true for their corresponding responses to quark chemical potential given by the 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> order coefficients.
- At high temperatures, except  $c_2$  and  $c_2^I$ , all the coefficients compare well quantitatively with the LQCD data.
- The main effect of the VdM term is to move  $c_2$  and  $c_4$  close to their respective SB limits.




FIG. 6: (a):  $\Phi$  (solid lines) decreases and  $\bar{\Phi}$  (dotted lines) increases as a function of  $\mu_0/T$  ( $\mu_I = 0$ ) at low temperatures and almost equal and constant at high temperatures. (b):  $\Phi$  (solid lines) and  $\bar{\Phi}$  (dotted lines) are equal and almost constant as a function of  $\mu_I/T$  ( $\mu_0 = 0$ ).



We have emphasized the role of the Polyakov loop in obtaining the values of the Taylor coefficients in our earlier works [6, 8]. In those works we found firstly that the Polyakov loop goes above 1 at high temperatures and also has a significant dependence on  $\mu_0$  but not on  $\mu_I$ . Here as shown in Fig. 6, the VdM term restricts the value of  $\Phi$  within 1, and also the  $\mu_0$  dependence at higher temperatures is almost negligible. Thus even the splitting between  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  has almost disappeared. We note here that though we let  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  to be different, they come out to be almost equal at high temperatures. This is in contrast to imposing  $\Phi = \bar{\Phi}$  for the full range of temperatures as done in Ref. [11]. The difference between  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  is responsible for the difference of  $c_2$  and  $c_2^I$  in the intermediate temperatures.

To complete the comparison with the LQCD data we have looked at the flavour diagonal ( $c_n^{uu}$ ) and flavour off-diagonal ( $c_n^{ud}$ ) susceptibilities defined as,

$$c_n^{uu} = \frac{c_n^{n0} + c_n^{(n-2)2}}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad c_n^{ud} = \frac{c_n^{n0} - c_n^{(n-2)2}}{4}. \quad (18)$$

The 2-nd order flavour diagonal and off-diagonal susceptibilities are given by,

$$\frac{\chi_{uu}(T, \mu_u = 0, \mu_d = 0)}{T^2} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 P(T, \mu_u, \mu_d)}{\partial \mu_u^2} \right|_{\mu_u = \mu_d = 0} = 2c_2^{uu}, \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{\chi_{ud}(T, \mu_u = 0, \mu_d = 0)}{T^2} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 P(T, \mu_u, \mu_d)}{\partial \mu_u \partial \mu_d} \right|_{\mu_u = \mu_d = 0} = 2c_2^{ud}.$$




FIG. 7: The flavour diagonal (*upper row*) and flavour off-diagonal (*lower row*) susceptibilities for  $n = 2, 4$  and  $6$  as functions of  $T/T_c$ . Symbols are LQCD data [16]. The arrows on the right indicate the respective ideal gas values.

These are shown in Fig. 7. Except  $c_2^{uu}$ , all the other LQCD diagonal and off-diagonal coefficients are close to their respective ideal gas values from  $1.2T_c$  onwards. The most striking discrepancy without the VdM term w.r.t the LQCD data was (see [8]) in the 2-nd order flavour off-diagonal susceptibility  $c_2^{ud}$ .  $c_2^{ud}$  signifies the mixing of  $u$  and  $d$  quarks through the contribution of the two disconnected  $u$  and  $d$  quark loops. While the LQCD data shows that this kind of correlation between the  $u$ - $d$  flavours are almost zero just away from  $T_c$ , the PNJL model results remained non-zero even upto  $2T_c$ . Adding the VdM term this part of the PNJL physics is now consistent with LQCD results. Below  $1.2T_c$  there is still a large quantitative difference between the PNJL and LQCD results for  $c_2^{ud}$ . Obviously the VdM term is not expected to affect the results at low temperatures significantly. At the moment it is not clear what physics lie behind the difference between PNJL and LQCD results for  $c_2^{uu}$  at high temperatures and  $c_2^{ud}$  at low temperatures. Perhaps the quark masses may hold an answer.

#### IV. SUMMARY

In this work the PNJL model of Ref. [3, 6, 8] has been extended by introducing a VdM term. The important change it brings about is to set the upper limit of the Polyakov loop to 1. With this model we have studied some thermodynamic properties of strongly interacting matter with the light flavours  $u$  and  $d$  within a certain range of temperature  $T$ , and small values of chemical potentials  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_I$ . In principle the VdM term affects all thermodynamic quantities. We adjusted the parameters in the model so that the pressure and energy density is close to that computed in LQCD. We have then made estimates of the specific heat, the speed of sound and conformal measure.

Further, we have extracted the Taylor expansion coefficients of pressure in the two chemical potentials upto 6-th order. All the coefficients approach their respective SB limit above  $2T_c$ . A quantitative comparison with the LQCD results show reasonable agreement, though the QNS  $c_2$  and the INS  $c_2^I$  on the Lattice are smaller by about 20 %. In contrast our earlier estimates [6, 8] of these coefficients without the VdM term showed that  $c_4$  and  $c_4^I$  differ from the LQCD results. Thus the main effect of the VdM term is to impose physical constraints on  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  such that at large temperatures the coefficients of the same order approach each other. This is clearly visible from the flavour off-diagonal coefficients shown in Fig. 7. The remaining difference of the values of the QNS and INS in the model and lattice still needs to be addressed. Possible future steps to bring in better agreement could be to include beyond mean field effects and/or to include some sort of temperature dependence to the coefficient of the VdM term. However the lattice quark masses may be important in bridging the gap. We already found that such data for pressure with almost physical quark masses [37] show an increase at any given temperature when compared to data with larger quark masses [36]. This would encourage us to believe that extraction of the susceptibilities with similar quark masses on the lattice may have a better agreement with our results. Another way to compare results would be to re-estimate the parameters of the NJL model directly from the pion mass and decay constants from the lattice. We hope to undertake such studies in future.

In an alternative formulation of the PNJL model including the effect of the VdM term, the coefficients  $c_2$ ,  $c_4$ ,  $c_6$  and  $c_8$  have been calculated [11]. Surprisingly, we more or less agree with those results quantitatively. Apart from the fact that this may be possible due to various adjustable parameters in both the models, the main reason seems to be the small dependence of  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  on the chemical potentials. The basic difference between the two approaches is in the use of the VdM potential. The VdM term is required to obtain the mean field solution of  $\Phi$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$ . But as we have explained in the formalism that it should not be included in the expression for pressure. On the other hand in Ref. [11] apart from obtaining the mean fields the VdM term is included while calculating the value of pressure. The difference in the mean field treatment coupled by almost same final results provide hints to the fact that mean field treatment has certain shortcomings and is unable to settle issues at hand. It would thus be worthwhile to look beyond.

#### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank A. Bhattacharya, S. Datta, S. Digal, S. Gupta, S. Mukherjee, P.B. Pal and R. Pisarski for many useful discussions and comments. We are thankful to A. Dumitru and O. Kaczmarek for useful discussions on the lattice computation of the Polyakov loop.

#### APPENDIX A

We demonstrate the methodology of extracting the average value of a quantity from mean field approximation. Suppose we have a variable  $\Psi$  with a probability distribution given by  $\exp(-\Psi^2)$  and we have to obtain the average of the function in the exponential  $\Psi^2$  (just like we have to obtain the average of  $\mathcal{V}$  in Eqn. 2). We define the distribution in the domain  $0 \leq \Psi \leq 1$ . The distribution is shown in Fig.8(a). The average is obtained as,

$$\langle \Psi^2 \rangle = \frac{\int_0^1 d\Psi \Psi^2 e^{-\Psi^2}}{\int_0^1 d\Psi e^{-\Psi^2}} = 0.2537 \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $Z = \int_0^1 d\Psi e^{-\Psi^2} = 0.747$  is like a partition function. In the given domain the distribution has no maximum and thus a mean field solution cannot be obtained. Let us now make a change of variable from  $\Psi$  to  $\Phi$  where  $\Psi = \Phi^2$ . The distribution becomes  $2\Phi \exp(-\Phi^4)$  as shown in Fig.8(b). Here,  $2\Phi$  is like the Jacobian in the main text. One can now easily check that corresponding to Eqn.A1, we need to find the expectation value of  $\Phi^4$  given by,




FIG. 8: (a)  $\Phi$  and (b) pressure for  $\kappa = 0$  ( $T_0 = 0.27$  GeV) and  $\kappa = 0.5$  ( $T_0 = 0.2555$  GeV). The value of  $T_c$  is 0.270 GeV.

$$\langle \Phi^4 \rangle = \frac{\int_0^1 2\Phi d\Phi \Phi^4 e^{-\Phi^4}}{\int_0^1 2\Phi d\Phi e^{-\Phi^4}} = 0.2537 \quad (A2)$$

In this case the distribution has a maximum and we can do a saddle point approximation. We thus minimize  $\Phi^4 - \ln[2\Phi]$  which gives the mean field value  $\langle \Phi \rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}$ . Using this value we find  $\langle \Phi \rangle^4 = 0.25 \simeq \langle \Phi^4 \rangle$ . So  $\langle \Phi \rangle^4$  gives a good approximation to  $\langle \Phi^4 \rangle$ . On the other hand if we include the logarithm term we have,  $\langle \Phi \rangle^4 - \ln[2\langle \Phi \rangle] = -0.0966$ , which is widely different.

- 
- [1] P. N. Meisinger and M. C. Ogilvie, *Phys. Lett. B* 379 163 (1996); *Nucl. Phys. B* (Proc. Suppl.) 47 519 (1996).
  - [2] K. Fukushima, *Phys. Lett. B* 591 277 (2004).
  - [3] C. Ratti, M.A. Thaler and W. Weise, *Phys. Rev. D* 73 014019 (2006).
  - [4] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, *Phys. Rev.* 122 345 (1961); *Phys. Rev.* 124 246 (1961).
  - [5] R. D. Pisarski, *Phys. Rev. D* 62 111501(R) (2000);  
R. D. Pisarski, in the proceedings "Marseille 2000, Strong and electroweak matter" edited by C.P. Korthals Altes, pg. 107-117, World Scientific, Singapore, 2001 (hep-ph/0101168).
  - [6] S. K. Ghosh, T. K. Mukherjee, M. G. Mustafa and R. Ray, *Phys. Rev. D* 73 114007 (2006).
  - [7] H. Hansen *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* 75 065004 (2007).
  - [8] S. Mukherjee, M. G. Mustafa and R. Ray, *Phys. Rev. D* 75 094015 (2007).
  - [9] Z. Zhang and Yu-X. Liu, *Phys. Rev. C* 75 064910 (2007).
  - [10] C. Sasaki, B. Friman and K. Redlich, *Phys. Rev. D* 75 074013 (2007).
  - [11] S. Roszner, C. Ratti and W. Weise, *Phys. Rev. D* 75 034007 (2007).
  - [12] B.-J. Schaefer, J. M. Pawłowski and J. Wambach, hep-ph/0704.3234.
  - [13] D. Blaschke, M. Buballa, A. E. Radzhabov and M. K. Volkov, hep-ph/0705.0384.
  - [14] E. Megias, E. R. Arriola, L. L. Salcedo, *Phys. Rev. D* 74 065005 (2006); *ibid Phys. Rev. D* 74 114014 (2006).
  - [15] L. D. McLerran and B. Svetitsky, *Phys. Rev. D* 24 450 (1981);  
B. Svetitsky and L. G. Yaffe, *Nucl. Phys. B* 210 423 (1982);  
B. Svetitsky, *Phys. Rept.* 132, 1 (1986).
  - [16] C. R. Allton *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* 71 054508 (2005).
  - [17] A. Dumitru, R. D. Pisarski and D. Zschesche, *Phys. Rev. D* 72, 065008 (2005).
  - [18] H. Steinacker, *Nucl. Phys. B* 679 66 (2004).
  - [19] G. Akemann, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 22 1077 (2007).
  - [20] P. N. Meisinger, T. R. Miller and M. C. Ogilvie, *Phys. Rev. D* 65 034009 (2002).
  - [21] M. G. Mustafa, *Phys. Lett. B* 318 (1993).
  - [22] C. Ratti, S. Roszner and W. Weise, hep-ph/0701091.
  - [23] E.-M. Ilgenfritz and J. Kripfganz, *Z. Phys. C* 29 79 (1985).
  - [24] O. L. Trnhammer and G. Olafsson, math-ph/9901005.
  - [25] G. Boyd *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. B* 469 419 (1996);  
Y. Iwasaki, K. Kanaya, T. Kaneko and T. Yoshie, *Phys. Rev. D* 56 151 (1997).

- [26] B. Beinlich *et al.* , *Eur. Phys. C* 6 133 (1999);  
M. Okamoto *et al.* , *Phys. Rev. D* 60 094510 (1999).
- [27] P. de Forcrand *et al.* , *Nucl. Phys. B* 577 263 (2000);  
Y. Namekawa *et al.* , *Phys. Rev. D* 64 074507 (2001).
- [28] O. Kaczmarek, F. Karsch, P. Petreczky and F. Zantow, *Phys. Lett. B* 543 41 (2002).
- [29] O. Kaczmarek, S. Gupta and K. Hubner, *PoS LATTICE 2007:195 (arxiv:0710.2277)* (2007).
- [30] O. Kaczmarek, *PoS CPOD07:043 (arxiv:0710.0498)* (2007).
- [31] E. Gava and R. Jengo, *Phys. Lett. B* 105 285 (1981).
- [32] E. Megias, E. R. Arriola, L. L. Salcedo, *J. H. E. P.* 0601 073 (2006); *ibid Phys. Rev. D* 75 105019 (2007).
- [33] A. Dumitru *et al.* , *Phys. Rev. D* 70 034511 (2004).
- [34] M. Cheng *et al.* , *Phys. Rev. D* 74 054507 (2006).
- [35] P. Petreczky, arxiv:0705.2175 (2007).
- [36] F. Karsch, E. Laermann and A. Peikert, *Phys. Lett. B* 478 447 (2000).
- [37] M. Cheng *et al.* , arxiv:0710.0354 (2007).